

Studies in Democracy

Julia H. Gulliver

UC-NRLF



\$B 138 479





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

Studies in Democracy

The Essence of Democracy

The Efficiency of Democracy

**American Women's Contribution to
Democracy**

By

Julia H. Gulliver, Ph.D., LL.D.

**President of Rockford College for Women
Rockford, Ill.**

**G. P. Putnam's Sons
New York and London
The Knickerbocker Press**

1917

UNIV. OF

TC 4-33
G8

COPYRIGHT, 1917
BY
G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS

... The Knickerbocker Press, New York

CONTENTS

I

	PAGE
THE ESSENCE OF DEMOCRACY	I

II

THE TWENTIETH-CENTURY SEARCH FOR THE HOLY GRAIL	32
--	----

III

THE EFFICIENCY OF DEMOCRACY	64
---------------------------------------	----

STUDIES IN DEMOCRACY

I

THE ESSENCE OF DEMOCRACY¹

OUR minds and hearts have been steeped in horrors for months past. All Europe has been converted into shambles. Each of the warring nations has been calling upon God as the sponsor of its particular cause—and the causes are, to all appearances, diametrically opposed. But in the Eternal there can be no schism. God, in whom all peoples, whatever their kindred or nation, live and move and have their being—God is one. As monotheists, how else can we read the riddle of the universe? God is good. As Christians, how else can we daily take upon our lips those supernal opening words of the Lord's prayer, "Our father, who art in heaven"?

¹ Baccalaureate Address, 1915.

2 The Essence of Democracy

What then? Why, then, there must be some "divine intent," not improbably some "far-off divine intent" which is going ultimately to justify all this ghastly suffering and bloodshed. What is it?

One of the most fundamental and perhaps one of the most justifiable causes that has been fixed upon for the present violent disturbance in Europe is the desire for, if not the necessity of, more territory,—greater breathing space,—room for expansion. At this point let me pause a moment to say that if the root of the trouble is here, and so far as it is legitimately here, we, as Americans, cut a sorry figure in assuming any superior virtue, because we are the advocates of peace and because we benevolently and impartially desire the good of humanity as a whole. Why? Because with the vast resources of this country that are still undeveloped and the wide-flung spaces still uninhabited, our virtue is no virtue at all, but merely a geographical accident.

The need for expansion—the need for "always something more, always something better,"

is to my mind, in very truth, the deep underlying cause of the present European war; it is the divine intent which will ultimately fulfil and so harmonize all these warring interests. Needless to say, however, that this cannot find expression in the mutually exclusive greed of the different nations for more territory. Do you remember the pumpkin I told you about some time ago, by way of illustration, which, in the initial stages of its growth, had been bound fast by an iron ring? Apparently this ring was an inexorable band that had nevertheless been powerless against the irrepressible vital principle that caused the pumpkin to grow in spite of it, to this side and to that, any way and every way, to work out its fulfilment. "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly," said Jesus. I think that I began quoting these words to you in your freshman year. To-day I find their meaning still unexhausted. Life, as contrasted with stagnation, negation, passivity, destruction, death; against this mighty, uptending power of life in the universe, Goethe's Mephistopheles

rages furiously, as has every Mephistopheles before and since his time. But, according to the poet's inspired insight, all the Mephistophelean forces that can be let loose by means of earthquake, tempest, wave, and fire are powerless against that magnificent vitality, which meets death with an ever newer and ever fresher infusion of life.

Of the twenty-eighth chapter of Isaiah, which has been read in your hearing this morning, George Adam Smith says: "It still tastes fresh to thirsty men." In it occur these words: "For the bed is shorter than a man can stretch himself on it; and the covering narrower than he can wrap himself in it." Dr. Smith explains in brief that when these words were written, they meant that men had formed in their minds a scheme of action that was too narrow for the events taking place. The men of Judah thought that some alliance with a foreign power would save them from impending political destruction. No, says Isaiah, the only way you are going to be saved is to believe in God. No man-made

device is going to meet the bigness and the horror of the calamity that threatens. Rather must you be caught up into the swing and the vastness of the Divine purposes, and wait for their revealment.

The impulse toward expansion which is causing the mighty upheaval we are witnessing to-day cannot be expressed in terms of increased territory. That bed is shorter than a man can stretch himself on it, and that covering narrower than he can wrap himself in it. There is a painting by an English artist, Alfred Hartley, called *Silvery Night*. It portrays the top of a wooded mountain reaching upward into the veiled moonlight of a summer night. All that is visible is the mountain-top and the sky. Hartley's critic quotes from Byron's *Childe Harold*:

"to me
High mountains are a feeling,"

and says that it is applicable to certain mountain pictures by this painter. It is applicable to

this one of which I am speaking, but the feeling does not stop with the mountain, which serves rather to carry the mind out and beyond itself into the infinitude of the stellar spaces. Let us beware, in the present situation, how we allow our minds to stop at any mountain-top, however lofty and sacred, lest we fall short of the greatness of the divine purpose in the present crisis. Many who would repudiate territorial expansion as an adequate end of this war, are crying out for peace as its desired culmination, and peace in the near future. Suppose peace could be concluded this summer, is it clear that anything would have been really settled? Is it not clear that it would eventuate merely in a truce that requires only time to break out again into hostilities? Peace at any price is a slogan at once too costly and too narrow to meet the present crisis.

Again, the claim that women have a peculiar right to demand the cessation of hostilities because of the hideous violation of the rights of the family that follows close in the wake of war, and because "in certain regards they are

more sensitive than men," especially as concerns the sanctity of human life, this claim, with whatever sweet reasonableness it is and may be urged, I venture here and now to repudiate as too narrow an interpretation of the times in which we live. Peace is a lofty eminence, the sanctity of the family is a mountain-top of human endeavor and aspiration. But, above these and including these, are starry spaces that reach wide and far, and they must be reckoned with in an evaluation of the situation. I deprecate this idea that the care of the home is chiefly or solely the woman's concern. I do not believe that the best men are any less sensitive than the best women to the sanctity of human life. Witness the superb renunciation of the men on the *Lusitania*, not one of whom kept a life belt for himself, but all of whom, so far as is known, relinquished the life belts they might have had themselves to save some helpless woman or child. Moreover, it would be no extravagance to say that there are hundreds, not to say thousands of American men, who would have done precisely the same thing

under the same circumstances, and would have done it grandly, with a smile on their faces and peace in their hearts, as Alfred Vanderbilt did it and as Frohman did it. I have frequently talked with you of the senior class regarding the peculiar function and duties of the woman. To-day I find this of too narrow a scope. Men and women are alike summoned to gird on the whole armor of God and to ask: What will make peace not only possible, but honorable and permanent? What can make the human personality more sacrosanct in all its relations, whether in the family or outside of the family than it is at present? We have already raised the question: What is the impulse toward expansion that is now at work among the nations of Europe? The answer to it furnishes a portico, as it were, to the answer of this more general question. To my mind, the impulse toward expansion, which underlies the present world-upheaval, is the impulse toward the *democratizing of Europe*. Whether you and I will see it or not, is beside the question. Just when, just how, or just

where it will actualize itself, who can say? But that it is coming is as sure, as inevitable, as the working of the law of gravitation.

What, then, in general, is the essence of democracy?

At bottom, it is, I believe, an attitude of mind and heart and soul. If we can determine in some measure what that attitude is, and if, so far as in us lies, we can make that attitude our own, we shall furnish the finest conceivable individual contribution to the need of the world at the present time. The making of bandages, the knitting of stockings, the care of the wounded, even the giving up of the physical life on the battle-field—believe me—are, in comparison, as bubbles on the surface of the stream.

What is the attitude of mind and heart and soul that constitutes the essence of democracy?

As the most effective way of getting a vital conception of what it is, may I call your attention to the fact that Abraham Lincoln was, by general acknowledgment, one of the greatest democrats that ever lived; that certain issues,

10 The Essence of Democracy

moreover, of our Civil war, in the defining and solution of which he so nobly actualized the spirit of democracy, furnish illuminating material for the evaluation of present day issues. How strongly he felt that the problem of democracy, as it was worked out in this country, was of world-wide significance, and how deeply he felt that his life itself was to be counted as refuse, if only he might help to solve it for us and for all people, is evidenced by his speech at Independence Hall, Philadelphia, February 22, 1861. He said:

"I have often inquired of myself what great principle or idea it was that kept this confederacy so long together. It was not the mere matter of the separation of the colonies from the motherland, but that sentiment in the Declaration of Independence which gave liberty not alone to the people of this country, but hope to all the world for all future time. It was that which gave promise that in due time the weights would be lifted from the shoulders of all men and that all should have an equal chance. This is the sentiment embodied in the Declaration of

Independence." He added that if this country could not be saved on that principle he would rather be assassinated on the spot than surrender it. The speech closed with these memorable words: "I have said nothing but what I am willing to live by, and, if it be the pleasure of Almighty God, to die by."

At that very time he knew that a conspiracy had been formed to kill him. We all know how the "last full measure of devotion" was required of him, in that it proved expedient that one man should die for the people—another striking confirmation of what I have said, that the preservation of human life is not an exclusive or even a pre-eminent function of the women of the race, but is rather a matter of human concern—a paramount duty which men and women are, one and all, highly summoned to perform.

No exhaustive study of our Civil war is necessary to furnish illuminating confirmation also of the fact I have wanted to make clear regarding the present war, namely, that peace and immediate peace may be bought at too dear a price. "Neither party," said President Lincoln

in his second inaugural address (1865), "neither party expected for the war [*i. e.* the Civil war] the magnitude or the duration which it has already attained. . . . Each looked for an easier triumph and a result less fundamental and astonishing." Just as some of the wisest and the finest among us now find the be-all and the end-all of this present war in immediate peace, in the preservation of the sacredness of the family tie, and so on, so there were many devoted spirits at the time of our Civil war who felt that the be-all and end-all of the war was the abolition of slavery—an idea that even now still obtains. Not so Mr. Lincoln. From the first, he grasped the real issue, namely, the preservation of the Union. This was what our Civil war was primarily for. Let it be engraved on the lintels of our doors. The abolition of slavery was an entirely secondary issue. Many felt that Mr. Lincoln could and should have brought the war to a close speedily, long before it was actually done,—a war in which "every twenty-four hours saw an expenditure of two millions of money,"—a war that averaged two

engagements a day for four years,—a war in which the flower of the nation's manhood was being slain,—a war in which the hearts of the nation's women were being crushed and the lives of the nation's little children were being broken on an inexorable wheel. Says Nicolay in his book on *Abraham Lincoln*: “The labor, the thought, the responsibility, the strain of the intellect and anguish of soul that he gave to his great task—who can measure?” That furrowed face upon which all this is written—who can look upon it unmoved?

Through it all he saw the situation “steadily and saw it whole.” He knew that unless we had a place and a nation, what was done in that place or nation, of any sort or description whatsoever, was an irrelevant question. Let us be thankful that there was a strong feeling in the North that upheld and supported him in his view that a war which, in essence, was a war for the preservation of the Union, should not be converted into a war, first and foremost, for the abolition of slavery. Was not Lincoln opposed to slavery then? Yea, verily. As early

as 1841 he saw ten or twelve slaves shackled together at Louisville and this is what he said of it: "That sight was a continued torment to me. . . . It is not fair for you to assume that I have no interest in a thing which has and continually exercises the power of making me miserable. You ought rather to appreciate how much the great body of the northern people do crucify their feelings in order to maintain their loyalty to the Constitution and the Union." The Constitution and the Union! These were the starry heavens that in Lincoln's mind towered above the mountain-top question ~~the~~ ^{of the} abolition of slavery—a mountain-top which, as has been abundantly shown, was a "feeling" to him. But at whatever cost, he would be loyal, first, last, and all the time, to the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence upon which it grew. What he could do, within the limits of the Constitution, to abolish slavery, that he would do, and did do. He never believed from the first that the Constitution permitted the abolition of slavery in the slave states. All that could be done, as he

believed, within the limits of the Constitution, was to prevent the extension of slavery into the other states and into the territories, where it did not already exist. When he did finally issue the proclamation that emancipated the slaves in all the states, he did it primarily not to free the slaves, but as a war measure to weaken the seceding states. Up to this time, he had been abused because he had not done it before. Now he was calumniated because he had done it at all. If he had done it earlier, he would have alienated the support of Maryland, Kentucky, and Missouri, in fact of all the border states. If he had not done it when he did, he would have imperiled the Union. "A house divided against itself cannot stand." Undoubtedly it is true that the two great achievements of his administration were the permanent re-establishment of the Union and the freeing of the slaves; but the second was logically and as a matter of fact distinctly subordinate to the first. How subordinate is evidenced by his solemn statement, "I will hold the states in the Union—with slavery if I must."

16 The Essence of Democracy

Let me bespeak your whole-souled attention to this clean-cut, spiritual discernment of relative values. In every situation, there is the possibility of preferring the lower to the higher, nay, of considering that the lower is the higher—the lower which, relatively speaking, may be as the husks that the swine do eat in comparison with the father's house and all the soul-goods that it represents. Is it not of vital importance for us to try to discern how this great democrat thus fulfilled the first essential condition of democracy? for so I consider it to be. His was no coldly exclusive intellectual decision. It had the whole man behind it. He was a unique exemplification of a self that was not mechanically divided up into water-tight compartments, but a self that attacked a problem organically as a living whole: that body of his inherited from the common people who work with their hands—a body of "rugged and stubborn health," as Phillips Brooks characterizes it; that brain of his trained to nice logical distinctions, and to the habit of precise statement; that soul of his with such a passion for fair

dealing that it was a common thing for his opponent in court to submit his case for trial on Lincoln's presentation of the facts rather than on his own; that heart of his so tender, so full of sympathy that drunkards and traitors and personal enemies turned to him for understanding and mercy when all else failed; that spirit of his so profoundly and awfully conscious of his own personality as, in the last analysis, the sole mountain-top of refuge for his torn and bleeding nation, but a mountain-top that, after all, brought salvation only because it helped to lead men's minds beyond itself to the starry heavens of God's purposes that encompass us and all peoples. Democracy, according to his own great words, is government "of the people, by the people, and for the people." If we approach this problem either without good red blood in our veins, or without firm intellectual fiber, or without the creative imagination, lighted, if God will, by glint of humor, that fuses heart and brain and enables us to put ourselves in our brother's place, we have missed the first essential of the democratic spirit.

18 The Essence of Democracy

We have wanted to make you good American citizens, first of all—vital members of this great pulsating, living being that we know as our democracy—the vine of which we are all the branches. Do you wonder, therefore, that we have striven, first of all, to give you an all-round education which has meant to the sweet maidenhood which you originally brought to us

“That mind and soul, according well,
May make one music as before,
But vaster.”

A personality, alive, growing, harmonized by a supreme consecration to a great life-purpose, and in vital relationship with other personalities—this was Lincoln, and Lincoln was a great democrat.

What is the essence of democracy?

To him, tingling with the blood that flowed through the veins of his nation, this problem was also alive. It was not a dead abstraction, but an expression of the living organism known as the American people. A government “of the

people, by the people, and for the people"—what does this mean in the last analysis? Nine times out of ten the answer that has been given is equality; democracy means, first and foremost, equality, which in turn means an artificial uniformity, and so something mechanical and dead.

John Graham Brooks in his book on *The Social Unrest* has a chapter on the Master Passion of Democracy, and that master passion he conceives to be the passion for equality, to be sure, but not equality in the usual sense. He speaks of the various Utopias, the object of which has been to actualize among their members an external and so an artificial uniformity. Among more familiar and recent examples, he instances Robert Owen's attempt in Indiana in 1826 to found a community of equality and to this end he insisted that the members, men and women respectively, should wear a uniform and, be it added, a very unbecoming uniform, as a result of which the men sulked, and the women revolted instantly and unmistakably, while they all promptly ceased to find anything agreeable

in each other's society. Mr. Brooks points out very pertinently that all these Utopian communities are necessarily composed of those who have had individuality enough to become extremely critical of society as they have experienced it, and that they naturally bring to the new society individualisms that amount to eccentricities. He quotes a private letter from a discouraged member of one of these societies to this effect: "We expected to attract queer people, but that there were so many kinds of queerness and that they could be so unreasonable we had to learn by most disheartening experiences."

De Tocqueville, whose monumental work on *Democracy in America* has not yet waxed old, says that democratic peoples have a taste for liberty, but an ardent, insatiable, incessant, invincible passion for equality—equality in freedom, equality in slavery, but equality.

However, Mr. Brooks points out as an inference from the case just quoted that, as a matter of fact, we don't want equality; on the contrary, we each of us want to be a little more prominent

and a little more distinguished than our fellows. In confirmation of this, let me instance the present American passion for automobiles which seems to have originated partly, at least, in the desire of the few to go so fast that everybody else would have to get out of their way (the automobile expression suggests this at any rate), but which, such being the leveling influence of democracy, seems destined to lapse into uniformity again, because everybody is going to have one.

Jesting aside, Mr. Brooks's contention is certainly just. What we want is not equality in the sense of a dead uniformity, which blots out all individuality; on the contrary, what we want—and this is a master passion with us—is elbow room, breathing space, and in our best moods, opportunity for everybody. People thrown together too closely, too constantly, too *narrowly*, and therefore too monotonously, are going presently to find each other unbearable. The unity of the national life, and *pari passu*, let us note, the unity of the family life, should be so rich in variety that the various

temperaments can find room for activity. "The apart instinct," concludes Mr. Brooks, "is as powerful as the together instinct." All forms of communism and socialism that attempt to transgress this fundamental principle by establishing identity in property, even—save the mark—in spiritual property, or what not, are bound to go to the wall. But when a socialist like Mr. Sydney Webb, quoted by Mr. Brooks, says: "We want to bring about the condition in which every member of society shall have a fair chance to use and develop the gifts with which he happens to be born," he is on the rock foundation of democracy, whether here or elsewhere.

Equality, in Mr. Lincoln's mind, never stood for a gray identity without difference. He never was a democrat in the sense that Walt Whitman, for example, was a democrat, as expressed by one of his sympathetic critics in the statement that "the difference between the president and the Broadway mason or hod carrier is inconsiderable—an accident of office," their common inalienable humanity being the one

important thing. Lincoln was altogether too sane a thinker to hold such a view, although Douglas and his adherents tried to make it out that he did hold it. "Invite a nigger to dinner," was their favorite challenge of Lincoln's position. In reply, Lincoln is at pains to explain (Quincy speech, 1858) that any scheme of perfect social and political equality with the negro is "but a specious and fantastical arrangement of words," and declares that he has no purpose of trying to bring about such a state of affairs; on the contrary, he agrees with Judge Douglas that the negro is not the equal of the white man in many respects, certainly not in color, perhaps not in intellectual and moral endowments. Notwithstanding all this, he nevertheless claims, with all the earnestness of which he is capable, that there is no reason in the world why the negro is not entitled to all the rights enumerated in the Declaration of Independence—the right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. "I hold," he adds, "that he [the negro] is as much entitled to these as the white man." Unequal in color,

perhaps in endowments, as the negro may be, according to Lincoln, he is the equal of any white man in the right to eat the bread which his own hand earns, and to eat it without the leave of anybody else.

Hence this great democrat saw, more than half a century ago, what the majority fail to see to-day, that equality does not mean identity, but rather the richest diversity in that, according to the true interpretation of the Declaration of Independence, every man is to have his chance—his own, and not another's.

Equality, then, properly interpreted, namely, to give every man, woman, and child a fair chance, is indeed of the essence of democracy.

If you would serve your country and so contribute to the world's need at the present crisis, with what a passion for service will you go forth to strive, with all the strength of your being, and up to the full measure of your ability, that every child may be well born, that every child may actualize his right to a healthy normal physical life, that every child may, so far as in him lies, enter into the intellectual

and moral heritage of the race to the end that he may realize his birthright to become an efficient citizen of this great commonwealth.

I have spoken of the principle of equality, thus vitally conceived, as on the rock foundation of democracy. I say on the rock foundation of democracy; for, to my mind, the principle of equality, rightly interpreted, inevitably conducts us to a more fundamental principle still.

Why should everybody have a chance?

Why do all just minds revolt at the goods and shackles idea, *i. e.*, the property idea, as applied to the human personality? Why, except that everything that we know outside of personality is a means to some end. Personality alone is an end in itself. As soon as and as far as human personality is used first and foremost to gratify some end of another's instead of being cherished for its own sanctity as a good in and of itself, we immediately feel the profanation of it. So long as we clutch at each other, in order to minister to our own greed, our own ambition, our own selfish affection even, the slaveholders

of the south are our natural brethren, before whom we may indeed have occasion to bow the head. Says Browning:

“Well, this cold, gray clod
Was man's heart;
Crumble it, and what comes next?
Is it God?”

Thus reads that grand old genealogy in Luke: “which was the son of Seth, which was the son of Adam, which was the son of God.”

Equality is based on the fact that you and no other can realize the thought of God concerning you, that God himself fails of fulfilment unless you fulfil your destiny as partaker of the divine nature, thus performing your function which no other can perform. Here, indeed, we reach bedrock in our search for the essence of democracy.

Here, too, we get the unifying principle that binds together the rich diversity of the unnumbered and innumerable personalities in a nation. “In God we live and move and have our being.”

As most of us have never grasped, in the sense that Lincoln grasped it, and in the sense that the best thinkers in general have grasped it, the vital idea of equality as meaning diversity, wealth of varying opportunity, rather than a dead identity, so as a nation we have been slow to grasp the true nature of the unifying bond that holds the diversity of individuals in an essential, unbreakable, inviolable oneness. It was only as a result of a slow evolutionary process that the states of this union realized that the union was anything more or better than a contract to be made and broken at will—a mere formal and external bond. “As the days of a tree are the days of my people,” says Holy Writ. This is the profounder reading of the nature of the national life. As the branches to a vine, so are the states to the common life of the whole. “The nation,” says Mulford in his book on *The Nation*, “the nation has unity, growth, identity of structure as every organism has,” that is, “the unity of the nation is the unity of an organism, not the aggregation of a mass.” This is the reason why any individual

state or any individual person who acts in isolation, contrary to the law of the whole, is like a dead limb that is no longer of significance because no longer a living organism. "Go, get you home, you fragments," quotes Mulford, from the words of Caius Marcius to the mob in Shakespeare's *Coriolanus*.

The proverbial and unreasonable restiveness of Americans against authority shows how far we are from understanding the real relationship that subsists between each one of us and the nation. To break the law of the whole is to lift murderous hand against the common life that courses through the veins of each of us, without which we are worse than nothing, in which we alone can find the fulfilment of our individual lives.

Here again the plummet of Lincoln's thought dropped deep into the heart of reality. "I hold," he said, "that in contemplation of universal law and of the Constitution, the Union of these states is perpetual. Perpetuity is implied, if not expressed, in the fundamental law of all national governments." (First Inau-

gural Address, 1861.) "It follows from these views," he continues, "that no state upon its own mere motion can lawfully get out of the Union." Even, he explains, if the nation were not one organically, as he has claimed, and the association of the states is in the nature of a contract merely, even so, can it, as a contract, be peaceably unmade by less than all the parties who made it? One party to a contract may violate it, break it, so to speak; but does it not require all, he asks, to lawfully rescind it? "Plainly, the central idea of secession is the essence of anarchy," so he concludes. Now we see, as perhaps we have not seen before, why President Lincoln believed it his duty, first and last and all the time, to preserve the inviolable life of the Union. To the seceding states, he says: "You have no oath registered in heaven to destroy the government, while I shall have the most solemn one to preserve, protect, and defend it."

I close with a brief summary:—

"God," it has been said, "is not a mere disaster-monger." "Is bread-corn crushed to

pieces? Nay, not forever is [the ploughman] threshing it, or driving his cartwheel and his horses over it; he doth not crush it to pieces." "For God doth instruct him aright, and doth teach him," so that "This also cometh from the Lord of hosts, which is wonderful in counsel, and excellent in wisdom."¹

"That in years that should be
 I would bring ye with patience through æons
 From slime through the forest to bliss;
 I would wean ye from climbings and fury to wings
 and to wisdom
 From dark sea-stupor to life."²

The end of the present European war is constructive, not destructive. The divine purpose is ever expressing itself in perpetual renewals. If we have read aright the signs of the times, the form that will be taken by the coming world-process of renewal and reconstruction is the spirit of democracy in its essence.

That spirit recognizes, first of all, the inviolable sacredness of personality in ourselves and

¹ T. K. Cheyne's translation.

² *New Poems, Midnight—The 31st of December, 1900;* Stephen Phillips.

in others as individual expressions of the divine life; hence it recognizes that no real personal relationship, whether in friendship, in the family, or in the state, can be regarded as something to be made or broken at will; if broken, it means nothing short of murder—the opening of the spiritual arteries of common life through which our own blood as well as our brother's ebbs out in a common death.

It is said of Charles Lamb that one day the conversation turned upon some man who was not present, and Mr. Lamb, who stuttered, said: "I—I—I hate that fellow." His friend said: "Charles, I didn't know you knew him." Lamb said: "I don't; I can't hate a fellow I know."

This defines the general analogy of the vine and its branches. Swinburne in his own exquisite fashion confirms it:

"I am in thee to save thee,
As my soul in thee saith;
Give thou as I gave thee,
Thy life-blood and breath,
Green leaves of thy labor, white flowers of thy
thought, and red fruit of thy death."¹

¹ *Hertha*, A. C. Swinburne.

II

THE TWENTIETH-CENTURY SEARCH FOR THE HOLY GRAIL¹

(As illustrated by the work of American women
along economic, civic, and legislative lines.)

TENNYSON'S *Idylls of the King* represents a highly modernized and Christianized version of the Search for the Holy Grail. Nevertheless for the age of feudalism and of chivalry the Grail quest sounded the highest note of aspiration and sanctity then known. In the transformation of the world from barbarism to civilization, it was the most potent influence. From a pagan magic vessel, the Grail had come to mean the cup used by Jesus at the last supper —the wine, a symbol of his life-blood, or, as sometimes conceived, a symbol of communion

¹ Address before the State Federation of Women's Clubs at the Second Congregational Church, Rockford, Ill., November 11, 1915.

with him. Viewed with reference to what had gone before, it represents a decided step in advance. It was a vision of a new heaven and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness. It was a shining in the dark. But like our visions to-day, it fell far short in practical accomplishment. The Knights of the Round Table were pledged, it is true, to the service of the poor, the weak, the oppressed, especially of women. But it was the act of a superior who graciously tried to correct what was wrong rather than the act of a comrade who sought to build up the social order. The practical results as shown in feudalism, were a system of vassalage and of the buying and selling of women in marriage. Hence from our present viewpoint, the system represents autocracy over against democracy—the privilege of the favored few rather than the rights of all.

The highest service that a knight could conceive was the finding of the wondrous and sacred thing known as the Grail. Only a few ever attained such purity as to be counted worthy to reach the goal and to behold the

Grail in its splendid reality. Those who went on the quest were obliged, perforce, to leave the common duties of life to search afar for this mystic object. They had no thought of bringing it back to a needy world; at most, they hoped to bring the knowledge of it to a few knights only. The quest called for an individual righteousness in some sense, to be sure, but contained no idea of a common salvation without which individual salvation is impossible, no organic idea of an indissoluble and growing union between the worshiper and the holy ideal that beckoned him. For this the times were not yet ripe. Only in a very external sense can God be said to have become an integral part of human life. Religion was, to a great degree, of such stuff as dreams are made of. Yet how does it add to our feeling of the solidarity of the race to realize that the gleam that they followed is the light that is shining for us and will ever shine more and more to the perfect day.

It is a far cry from these medieval conceptions to the theology of Calvin in the sixteenth

century, revised for us in this country by Jonathan Edwards in the eighteenth century. Yet the same lack of wholeness appears here in different form. Here, to be sure, the quest is not for a thing, no matter how sacred, but for a God who is conceived as a spirit to be worshiped in spirit and in truth. Yet the God of Calvin and of Edwards not only dominates but annihilates his worshipers. His glory is the one thing in heaven or earth that is to be desired or sought for. Personal salvation consists in the wiping out of the individual will by submerging it in the divine sovereignty. In this consists personal salvation and only such can be saved as God may arbitrarily elect. The favorite and ultimate question, "Are you willing to be damned for the glory of God?" indicates the further idea of annihilation rather than of organization, life, development. Francis Thompson expresses it in *The Hound of Heaven*:

"Ah! is Thy love indeed
A weed, albeit an amaranthine weed
Suffering no flowers except its own to mount?"

Nevertheless these great men we have been discussing were God-intoxicated souls. One must look far for a more exalted idea of the beauty and wonder of the divine nature than appears in the pages of Jonathan Edwards. Be it also said that they had an appreciation of the human personality far beyond that of any of the traditional systems that had preceded them. The light they follow we follow still.

“After it, follow it,
Follow the Gleam.”

In contrast with these ideals we have been discussing, what is the ideal that is unfolding in the twentieth century? Instead of the theological God, so abhorred by Goethe, who created the world and sent it spinning off into space to take no further responsibility or thought about it, we have the idea of an immanent God who is above all, still, but through all and in all. It is Hegel’s idea of a God who has come up through the various stages of the evolution of his creation more marred than any man, “covered with the dust and the blood

of centuries." It is Jesus' idea of a God who wherever one of his children is hungry or thirsty or in prison or cold, is hungry or thirsty or in prison or cold, with his child. In other words, the modern ideal is of a society that is an organic whole bound together into one by the transfusion of the divine life.

We see now that no soul can seek its own salvation apart from the whole, that the God we worship is no static, dead abstraction, uninteresting in its fixity of perfection through the æons, but a God that depends for his perfection and his growth upon the world that he has created. It is this God that groaneth and travaileth in pain waiting for the redemption of his world, and who must forever suffer lack while one of his children is wandering alone in the darkness and the cold—an unredeemed soul.

However far short we are of realizing these ideals, I venture to say that never before in the history of the world have they been embodied as they are embodied in the sculpture and mural paintings at the Exposition at San Francisco, which in turn have been suggested

to the artists who created them by their realization in human life to-day, especially here in America. Probably to a later century we shall seem to fall as far short as an earlier age seems to us to fall short. But in San Francisco one is thrilled with the conviction that, with all our shortcomings, this nation is following on to know the Lord.

It will be my purpose in what follows to show that in artistic presentation at San Francisco and in actual life, women are participating and are acknowledged to be participating more fully now than ever before in the work of reconstruction and upbuilding.

Wells says¹: "Compared with our older continents, America is mankind stripped for achievement, because of its detachment from tradition." "All America, north and south alike, is one tremendous escape from ancient obsession into activity and making. Naturally one begins to do things, one is inspired to do things, one feels that one has escaped, one feels that the time is now."

¹ *The Passionate Friends.*

These words give one the *feel* of the exposition in San Francisco. The completion of the Panama Canal has sent a thrill of new hope and joy not only through our own country, but throughout the whole world as well. The fine, strong international note sounded in Chicago by the Parliament of Religions has become so dominant in the sculptures of the San Francisco exposition, that the Holy Grail of endeavor may be said to have become distinctly evolved there from a national to an international ideal. The union of our eastern and western coasts by the Panama Canal is symbolic of the union of the Orient and of the Occident. This is typified by the Court of the Universe at San Francisco. This Court is approached by two great arches, one the arch of the Nations of the East, the other the arch of the Nations of the West, facing each other. They stand for the brotherhood of man. The elephant that forms the center of the oriental group is balanced by the prairie schooner that forms the center of the group of pioneers representing the west. On the tongue of the prairie schooner, between the

oxen, is the figure of a young woman, beautiful, strong, courageous, womanly. She has a prophetic vision of the dangers and the privations that await her, but she is undaunted. Mr. Calder, the artist who created her, calls her "The Mother of To-morrow." The hope of the future is represented by two lads, one white and the other negro. Note that, please, the other *negro*. This democratic ideal brought out constantly in the San Francisco exposition, fills one with pride and joy and thanksgiving aside from any other feature of it. It might naturally be expected that the credit for the Panama Canal as the link that unites the Atlantic and Pacific, would be given to a personification of capital, or to an idealized representation of General Goethals, the great engineer who has overcome every obstacle, and who acted as leader and judge and friend in the whole enterprise with an almost absolute rule, where there was no appeal except to the President of the United States. But in a mural painting under the Arch of the Tower of Jewels called *The Atlantic and Pacific*, by William De

Leftwich Dodge, the credit is not given to capital, it is not even given to the great leader of the enterprise, but to *labor*, typified in a splendid, sinewy, muscular form; and this is not only acknowledged by the artist, but acknowledged by General Goethals himself in his description of his men as "the best Americans that ever trod shoe leather."

In further exemplification of the democratic tendencies of the exposition, one of the most interesting of the statues to me was *The Genius of Creation*, by Daniel Chester French, among the most successful, honored, and loved of American sculptors. This statue represents the genius of creation with outspread arms against a background formed by her beautiful wings that rise above her head and shadow her face so that its expression is hidden in mystery. On one side, is the figure of a young man of powerful physique, with fine, clean-cut profile, and hands clenched—an embodiment of the desire and ability to achieve. On the other side, is the figure of a woman, her long hair drooping over her face, her eyes looking into the

distance, poetical, dreamy, meditative, dreaming dreams and seeing visions. Behind the statue, her hand reaches back and rests lightly on the clenched fist of the man. Above there is an inscription: "The Alpha and Omega." The thing to be noted is that the woman is included as an essential part in the creative force of the universe. Has this ever been thus publicly acknowledged before?

As an expression of the practical embodiment of this dream, I would remind you of the wonderful tribute to woman's actual achievement in the prominent position given to the young woman as the Mother of To-morrow in the group of the *Nations of the West* already described. Another statue, *The Pioneer Mother*, by Charles Grafley, occupies the place of honor at the entrance of the Palace of Fine Arts and is of permanent bronze. The figure is of great dignity. It scintillates with intelligence and power as well as with tenderness. Two babies rest against her confidently and the inscription composed by President Wheeler of the University of California reads: "Over rude paths beset

with hunger and risk, she pressed on toward the vision of a better country. To an assemblage of men busied with the perishable rewards of the day, she brought the threefold leaven of enduring society—faith, gentleness, and home, with the nurture of children."

I find here a certain correction, perhaps better an enlargement of French's vision in *The Genius of Creation*. There the two figures are looking different ways. They are supplemental, but divided. One feels that, in essence, they can never thoroughly understand each other. This ignores one of the most encouraging signs of the times, namely, that the viewpoint of the man and of the woman are gradually approaching each other. I speak here only of the change that is taking place in woman. In the conception of the Mother of To-morrow in the group of the *Nations of the West* and in *The Pioneer Mother* that I have already described, we find presages of certain characteristics now being developed by women that mean nothing short of a bloodless revolution for the world of to-morrow.

It is my special purpose now to inquire in detail how far the great ideals expressed in the exposition regarding women, are at present justified by the contribution that American women have made to American life. Many of the deeper contributions of the spirit, represented by President Wheeler's idea of their permanent contribution to society in faith, gentleness, and home, with the nurture of children, cannot be handled and seen and estimated as can the results obtained along the line of economics, civic improvement, and legislative reforms. Here he who runs may read. Here, too, the club women have made their important contribution. It appears to me, then, especially appropriate that it should be discussed in this presence.

As a preparation for any specific setting forth of what women have accomplished along these lines, will you not let me take your hand and will you not go with me into the Interpreter's House for a little space that we may perchance orientate this woman's contribution to the twentieth century in its relation to the mighty

world movements and national movements that the *Zeitgeist* is now unfolding to our gaze?

To my mind, the great struggle that is now going on across the water has for its rationale the democratizing of Europe. My conviction is that it is our most sacred duty, both men and women, at present, as contributory to this great world movement, to realize in our hearts and lives the essential spirit of democracy and to embody it in the life of our nation more and more completely. As Abraham Lincoln said: "The spirit of democracy meant liberty to the people of this country and hope to all the world for all time." It is in essence an attitude of mind and heart and soul. It is not the demand for equality; (it was this idea that brought a new ruin on the South during the reconstructive period as is so vividly portrayed in *The Birth of a Nation*). The spirit of democracy is a passionate yearning that everybody shall have his proper chance to realize his life as God intended him to live it. As the matter is probed deeper and we ask *why* everyone should have an equal chance, the answer comes

in the sacredness and ultimate value of the human personality.

So understood and so interpreted, the spirit of democracy, for a new birth of which the world groaneth and travaileth in pain together to-day, is as old as the human race.

In this country it has reappeared in a movement which, of all the new things and the new discoveries and the new trends in society during the last twenty-five years, will, I think, be generally conceded as the most characteristic and the most important. I refer to the evolution of the social conscience in which the spirit of democracy among us has come to flower and fruitage as never before. Ex-President Tucker of Dartmouth in a very thoughtful article in the *Atlantic Monthly* for September, 1915, on "The Progress of the Social Conscience," says that it has changed "the *angle* of moral vision so that we see the same things differently." He compares it with the new mental framework furnished by the doctrine of evolution that so reconstructed the world of thought in the nineteenth century. He points out that the

aim of the social conscience has been reconstructive as well as reformatory. The social conscience, in other words, is a creative force. What next? This, and please note it carefully: "The actual progress which it has made," he says, "is best reflected in the changes wrought in public opinion." . . . "Public opinion, as the governing force in modern democracy, is the objective of the social conscience."

Have women become a real power to be reckoned with in the formation of public opinion? President Wilson, in a recent utterance, said that he knew of *no body of persons comparable to a body of women for creating an atmosphere of opinion*. In the article I have been quoting from Dr. Tucker, he indicates that in this new development of the social conscience one of the most novel and important features is the entrance of women into the responsibilities and opportunities of civic life. "The widening of the field of investigation for legislative purposes," he writes, "is largely in those directions in which women of trained minds can best act as experts. And many of

48 Search for the Holy Grail

the administrative positions created within this widening field under legislative supervision can best be filled by women."

We have long been taught that man is the creator and woman the conserver in human society. Initiative is the man's function. Conservation is the woman's function. Fundamental and inexpugnable physiological differences between the man and the woman have been pointed out as the ever-active cause of this differentiation in function from the beginning of human history even until now. This has given rise to many utterances that, in the face of all the surprises that the evolutionary process is unfolding for us, place a definite limit on the inexhaustible and ever-evolving life-forces of the universe as far as women are concerned. For example, Professor Thorndike of Columbia says that "the restrictions of woman to the mediocre grades of ability and achievement should be reckoned with by our educational systems."

The Nobel prize, which is given to persons who have contributed most materially to

benefit mankind during the year preceding its bestowal, has a value of about \$30,000.00, and is given in physics, chemistry, medicine, literature, and the advancement of peace. The fact that since the establishment of this prize in 1901, Madame Curie, a Polish woman, received the prize in physics in 1903 conjointly with her husband, that she received it again (1911) in chemistry for what she herself had done exclusively, that Madame Bertha von Suttner, an Austrian, received the prize for her books and other efforts in the advancement of peace in 1905, that Selma Lagerlöf (Swedish) received the prize in literature in 1909, ought to give one pause in uttering such prohibitive ultimatums as that just quoted from Professor Thorndike.

However, it is my main purpose to confine myself in this discussion, as I have said, to the economic forces set in motion by women, since here is something that, though in essence a matter of the spirit, expresses itself in tangible results that can, to a degree, be weighed and measured.

Mrs. Cooley, President of the Chicago Wo-

man's Club, confirms the opinion of one of her department chairmen, that the practical and philanthropic work of the club is vitalized and energized by the contemplation of the ideal and the beautiful in their study classes. Now I wish to show that, in keeping those two elements combined, the club women of this country have worked *creatively*. Will you pardon me at this point, if I stop to introduce a homely bit of metaphysic, because that alone will justify my contention. Every part of reality represents the union of an idea or an ideal with an actual concrete situation into which it has been practically wrought. To illustrate: an abstract presentation of numerical relations such as the relation of equality which does not carry the mind of the child over to particular things that are equal, is a dead abstraction and so meaningless. When it comes to be a question whether the child will or will not accept three halves of his neighbor's apples for four halves of his own, there is a change from a dead to a living option, as James would say. On the other hand, a teacher may present cubes,

straws, and the like, to make real geometrical forms *in such wise* that the child's attention is so absorbed in the bright colors and other unessential details that he altogether loses the meaning. Facts are dead without meaning. Ideas are dead until they have been organically united with actualities. Whenever and wherever an idea that has been a mere abstraction or theory has been worked out in the concrete of a given situation, then something has been brought into the world that was not there before, that is, something creative has been done. To incarnate an idea in a given situation is one of the specific ways in which the transcendent God of the older theologies is becoming the immanent God of the twentieth century.

(The great democratic ideal—that everyone should have the chance he is capable of availing himself of—is not the product of a single mind. It is the result of the common experience and the common thinking of many generations. Even to-day we but dimly comprehend its meaning. In the evolution of the social conscience, one of the great things accomplished by men has been

(again I refer to Dr. Tucker's article) along the lines of correcting and controlling monopolies by legislation. Thereby they are actualizing the abstract democratic ideal. Something exists that did not exist before. Hence they have worked creatively. The creative work of men up to this time, and for some time to come, must loom large in comparison with the creative work of women, because through the suffrage and through their function as providers, they have had all the forces of government and of business at their disposal—an organized dynamic and technique of action hitherto practically denied to women. I am not discussing here the desirability or undesirability of woman's suffrage. What I am wishing to point out is that organization of some sort is indispensable, if she ever convinces the world of the power of initiative that she possesses. It is an interesting fact that the formation and growth of the General Federation of Women's Clubs in this country since 1890 is practically synchronous with the evolution of the social conscience, the connection between the two

being especially marked during the last fifteen years. The history of the General Federation with its line of noble presidents, as given by Mary I. Wood in her book on *The History of the General Federation of Women's Clubs*, is a wonderful and inspiring story. Therein is set forth the progress of the women of this country away from individualism into the idea of "working together for the upbuilding of a kingdom on earth in which each shall serve her fellow-creatures and all shall work together for the good of the whole."

This steady progress of the organized women of the country away from an egoistic unsympathetic self-assertion of the individual as a separate human atom, to the idea that no soul can be saved without the common salvation of all, to the further idea that every personality is sacrosanct as an expression of the divine, represents the development of one of the great forces of the century. In place of prejudice and contention, it has brought union and sympathetic understanding and so has made woman a creative force in the United

States that is not only winning recognition, but compelling it by indisputable practical demonstration.

Specifically, what have women done to realize the spirit of democracy as expressed in the social conscience?

For the information that follows, I am indebted to a book that has just been published in the National League series written by Mary Ritter Beard on *Woman's Work in Municipalities*. Sometime I hope that such books will not have to be written. Sometime I hope that there will be no necessity for such an address as I am giving you to-day, because the constructive ability of women will be fully recognized, and because men and women will be working together for the good of society with such sympathetic understanding that it will be impossible to assign any given result to one rather than to the other, since their common endeavor will be like the seamless coat of Jesus that could not be torn one part from another, without ceasing to be at all. But, at present, such a book as Mrs. Beard's and such an ad-

dress as this are necessary, in order to demonstrate the still supposedly undemonstrated and undemonstrable theory that women can work creatively.

Let it be fully understood, from beginning to end of this address, that the work done by women is here regarded as only one expression of the great world-wide humanitarian movement that has been gathering force for the last twenty-five years. The contribution made by women and by club women must be distinctly envisaged as a part of a whole in which men and women are working together.

In this country, the inception of the social movement is to be found in the social settlements. Here men and women have indeed worked together. But with the shining name of Jane Addams (one of the graduates of Rockford College, by the way) as the founder of the first and certainly one of the greatest social settlements in this country in 1889, Miss Lillian Wald as the president of the National Federation of Settlements, Vida Scudder, Professor at Wellesley, an active promoter of the cause,

and innumerable other women as the heads or earnest co-workers in these organizations, I think we may say that women must at least be regarded as co-workers with men, such as Graham Taylor, Robert Woods, and many others, in the creative work that has been accomplished. In 1906 there were three times as many women as men engaged in settlement work and the proportion is probably not greatly different at present. Over four hundred of these settlements have now been established in two thirds of the States of the Union. "It is not too much to say," says Dr. Tucker, "that the influence which emanated from these social centers has been the leaven of social reform in our cities." The need of recreation, child welfare, instruction of mothers in the physical basis of well-being and morals, the possible co-operation of home and school, represent some of the outstanding activities of the settlements. Miss Elsa Dennison in a book called *Helping School Children*, quoted by Mrs. Beard, has shown how these activities have gone over from the settlement to the school

so that at present the school is becoming "one huge settlement with a thoroughly democratic basis instead of a philanthropic foundation," just, as we shall presently see, the city is being changed from a mere lodging place to a great home for its citizens. Thus to the general movement in modern society, from charity to justice, from the ameliorating of conditions to a determination of the cause of the evil and the change of social conditions that have brought it about, women have made their substantial contribution.

If creative work has been done by our nation in converting the Spanish dream of the Panama Canal into the actual Panama Canal, then creative work has been done by the settlements and by the women perhaps more prominently than the men in assimilating the beautiful dream of the Nazarene as set forth by the parable of the good Samaritan, and in realizing it in our democracy to-day as the settlements have helped to realize it.

The care of the child from infancy on through adolescence has always been the natural and

special care of the women. How has this become democratized?

Passing by many eminent names of women who have been hard workers and scientific investigators along these lines in the American Association for the Study and Prevention of Infant Mortality, I may mention the Federal Children's Bureau, the establishment of which has been so often and so repeatedly urged by different club women and finally by the whole Federation. Julia Lathrop, a Rockford woman whom we all delight to honor, has been made its head. She found that as a matter of fact we know nothing accurately on the subject of infant mortality, as not a single state or city in the United States has the data for a correct statement. The Bureau is now getting out a series of monographs, a statement as to the efforts being made in cities of 50,000 or over to reduce mortality, a study of prenatal care (made at the request of the Congress of Mothers), a review of child labor legislation in the United States, etc. Miss Lathrop's plan is to have the actual investigating done by

committees of women, in most instances members of the General Federation of Women's Clubs. Dr. Sherwood, Dr. Harriet L. Lee, Dr. Helen Putnam, and others, all trained and able women, are acting as chairmen of these committees. What work could more effectively actualize the hope of Jesus when he said: "Suffer the little children to come unto me and forbid them not"?

Time fails to tell of the many practical exhibits in child welfare and city welfare gotten up by women,—a most effective and practical means for bringing about reform,—of their efforts concerning child labor, of the open air schools and of the playgrounds that their efforts have brought into being, of the investigations of dance halls, fifteen hundred of these investigations having been made by women officers in Chicago alone, with successful results in securing propriety and obedience to law. Jane Addams's book on *The Spirit of Youth and the City Streets* has been a most influential factor along these lines.

In their efforts in behalf of the children,

women have had the necessity of municipal housekeeping forced upon them. Franklin MacVeagh says: "The women of Chicago started every one of the fifty-seven civic improvement centers of the city." In almost every city women have been behind this movement. "There is scarcely a town in Illinois," says Mrs. Beard, "where women are not planning wholesome recreation for girls and boys." Pure milk, pure water (notably in New Orleans under the leadership of Kate Gordon), pure food, cheap ice, clean streets ("volumes concerning women and clean streets could be written") have become actualities, time and again, through their efforts. They have conducted anti-fly, anti-smoke, and anti-mosquito campaigns. Mrs. Beard has demonstrated in her book the truth of her statement that the subject of public health has been broadened into a democratic and governmental point of view by women. They have made a real contribution in perfecting the machinery by which democracy may lay the foundation of health, happiness, and power. In many of these

activities, it is only fair to say in passing that the Woman's Christian Temperance Union has done yeoman's service side by side with the regular woman's clubs; also that in all these things women are working side by side with men, as well as independently.

In a further effort toward democratizing our commonwealth, women have worked for and obtained special care and special educational opportunities for crippled children, for mentally defective children, for blind children, for colored children, for tubercular children, and for foreigners. They have worked for vocational training in the public schools, for manual training schools, for night schools, for truant and parental schools, and open air schools. There are now four hundred and ninety-five women county superintendents in the United States. Four states, Colorado, Idaho, Washington, Wyoming, have women at the head of the state school systems. The work of Catharine Waugh McCulloch, a Rockford College graduate, in Evanston, of Dr. Katherine Davis, Commissioner of Corrections

in New York City, of Mrs. M. Gordon McCouch of Dallas, Texas, of Mrs. Mary Bartelme, "an acute, well-trained lawyer," judge of the court for delinquent girls in Chicago, the work of the Juvenile Protective Association in Chicago, the work of club women all over the country for the establishment of juvenile courts—all this needs only to be called to mind to prove the truth of the statement that women have introduced the spirit of social service into legal procedure.

Is all this merely a work of conservation?

As an offering to our beloved Republic, women have brought live children instead of dead children, happy and healthy and trained children instead of diseased and ignorant and criminal children. To the body politic, they have brought cleanliness in place of filth, beauty in place of ugliness, joy in place of heaviness.

"Red blood and warmth and laughter," "beauty, romance, and splendor," have they added to life in ways that can be demonstrated, in results that can be seen and handled and touched.

"I am come that they might have life and that they might have it more abundantly," said Jesus. Has anybody ever had the temerity to claim that such work is not creative, that it is merely conservative?

How grandly has the transcendent God of the eighteenth and even of the nineteenth century become the immanent God of the twentieth century through these devoted efforts of the women of our country! In thus incarnating the spirit of democracy and the spirit of social service in our commonwealth, American women are participating in the great world movement toward a new incarnation of the deity.

III

THE EFFICIENCY OF DEMOCRACY¹

"For the spirit of the living creature was in the wheels." Ezekiel i., 20.

EFFICIENCY means the ability to bring the best to pass in a given situation with the least possible expenditure of time, effort, money, and power, and a minimum of waste, whether psychical or physical. "Efficiency," says Edward Earle Purington, Director of the Efficiency Service of the Independent, "efficiency is the science of self-management."² That is to say, self-management is the *modus operandi* by which we may so evolve, conserve, and direct our powers as to be of the greatest possible use to our day and generation.

¹ Baccalaureate Address, June 11, 1916.

² *Efficient Living*, Robert M. McBride & Co., 1915.

This is efficiency from the viewpoint of democracy.

Efficiency, on the other hand, if we may summarize the German credo on the subject, is, as to method, the science of state control.

This is efficiency from the viewpoint of an autocracy.

Purington goes on to show that we are far from having realized the ideal of efficiency in this country. He points out that it is estimated that seventy-three men out of every hundred are in the wrong job; that most men utilize only about a third of their mental and spiritual forces; that from 20 to 40 per cent. of the motion in the average kitchen is lost motion; that one dollar out of every five spent on the household is wasted; that our business firms lose \$100,000,000.00 a year through ineffective advertising; that in the United States there are always 3,000,000 persons on the sick list; that the number of preventable deaths each year is 63,000; that the annual waste from preventable death and disease is \$1,500,000,000.00; and that somewhere in this country a workman is

66 The Efficiency of Democracy

being killed every four minutes, and another being injured every four seconds. This, of course, is only an estimate, but I am told it is, in several of its specifications, probably an underestimate.

So far forth, the efficiency of democracy appears to be the inefficiency of democracy.

As to the status in Germany, in contrast to all this writers, like Frederic C. Howe in his book on *Socialized Germany*,¹ point out that the human waste that is occurring in this country is, to a great extent, being avoided in Germany:

(1) Because of the incomparable system of education provided and to a degree enforced by the state, including universities, gymnasia, technical schools, commercial colleges, schools of industrial art, of artistic handicraft, of manual dexterity, of business organization, and of state-craft, which enable several hundred thousand students every year to specialize to the last degree along every line of thought, science, and industry, efficiency in industry being further promoted by the fact that the state sends men

¹ Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915.

to spend years in England, America, and the German colonies to learn manufactures and the detailed wants of the most distant markets. The possibility of the round peg in the square hole is thus reduced to a minimum, since the individual, within limitations to be noted hereafter, has a chance to learn what he can do best and how he can do it most efficiently.

(2) Because of insurance laws against accident, invalidity, sickness, and old age. When a working man is out of work through no fault of his own, the state frequently looks up work for him. When sick, he is taken care of by the state in wonderful convalescent homes, tuberculosis hospitals, etc. These insurance funds are maintained in general by enforced contributions from the working men, the employers, and the community. "State concern for the dependent classes," says Howe, "has been the traditional policy of Prussia for centuries." "The state has its finger on the pulse of the worker from the cradle to the grave." The right kind of work, not too much of it, and work done under sanitary conditions, is the aim.

(3) Because of the perfection of technical equipment and improvement of the organization of economic labor, the state has lifted millions out of material misery and has opened higher values of life to them. So writes Karl Helfferich in his monograph on *Germany's Economic Progress*. He emphasizes the fact that one of the Kaiser's great contributions to the public good has been his striking comprehension of the close connection between technical achievement and the natural sciences. Applied science, the application of scientific principles to given concrete situations with a definite purpose to be accomplished, the co-operation of the German scholar with the German business man and artisan—this has meant unprecedented efficiency in the economic world.

The German mind is set against waste, whether in human material or economic product. On a territory smaller than Texas, they support a population of about 64,000,000 as over against our population of about 100,000,000. They stand for unity, uniformity, perfection, orderliness, finish.

Is this, then, the efficiency of an autocracy?

Professor Patten of the University of Pennsylvania in a very thoughtful article in the *Survey* (March 6, 1915) discusses the philosophy that underlies the facts I have been citing regarding German efficiency versus American efficiency or the lack of American efficiency. He says that political and moral freedom has been the goal of endeavor in this country, while the public weal has been the goal in Germany. Every economic advance carries with it, he points out, an increase of mechanical action, and by this he seems to mean the perfection, not only of material machinery, but the perfection of the political and social mechanism of the state. He thinks that economic progress here as elsewhere must mean an evolution from the status of freedom to that of welfare. He realizes that it is going to be difficult for Americans to accept this, as most of us would say: "Better a day of freedom than an age of automatic regularity." Somehow or other, he feels that in this country we must unite the two ideals of welfare and freedom.

Is German efficiency, as above briefly described, contradictory in theory and practice to the democratic idea?

Before answering this question, we must complete the picture of German efficiency. It gives, as Howe points out, industrial freedom, but not personal and political freedom.

While a distinction should be made between northern and southern Germany, in favor of certain marked democratic tendencies in southern Germany, especially in local city self-government, it can hardly be disputed that Germany, as a whole, is ruled, and that to an increasing degree, by the great estate owners of Prussia. Untouched politically by the French Revolution, which so profoundly influenced various European countries, Prussia, and through Prussia Germany as a whole, according to Howe, represents the eighteenth-century idea of the feudal state. But it is a feudal state with the viewpoint of a benevolent paternalism adapted to modern conditions. Nowhere, according to the same author, does the state do so much for the individual. The devotion of the people to the

✓ fatherland is in part explained, says the same author, by the devotion of the fatherland to the people. The state is concerned with the health, education, comfort, and efficiency of the people. This is not, however, for the sake of the individual, but for the sake, primarily, of the state. No other nation has so completely subordinated the individual to the state. Caste is found everywhere. The state freely provides an education to the individual, but the state decrees that the child, save in exceptional cases, must be educated for the station in life to which he is born. The career of an Abraham Lincoln would hardly be thinkable under such a system. State censorship of the universities, of the press, and of the church, precludes, save within limits laid down by the state, freedom of thought, freedom of conscience, and freedom of speech—the bedrock of our democracy.

Howe emphasizes the fact that Germany's freedom is in the economic field and ours in the political field. He believes that there is nothing essentially undemocratic in the economic welfare and efficiency of the individual in Germany.

That there is nothing essentially undemocratic in public education and compulsory public education, we are the last people to deny. It is an integral part of our democratic system. That we can and must learn of Germany in making our educational system more thorough, more far-reaching, and more complete than it is at present, is, to my mind, the handwriting on the wall, if we as a democracy would keep our place in the sun, both politically and commercially, as over against a feudal state like Germany. That the individual should be developed to his highest potency because fitted by education to fulfil his function, as well as that economically he should have his chance, are, in their very essence, democratic ideals.

So far as Germany succeeds in doing this, as neither we nor any other country succeed in doing it, we must look for the efficiency of the democratic ideal in Germany rather than in America. But the method and the spirit in which it is accomplished cannot be reconciled with democracy, for that method and spirit is to iron out the individual except in so far

as the cultivation of this individual is useful to the state, and this means, mainly, so far as the individual is economically useful to the state.

The German state is, by general consent, a vast mechanism. It runs with all the finish, the smoothness, the perfection of machinery. It is impossible from the very nature of the case that any such perfect and rapid results can be attained in a democracy, where the state exists primarily for the individual, not the individual for the state, where there is not one centralized external authority that controls the whole, but where the individual is expected to exercise self-control, and uniformity of action can be attained only through the education of public opinion and personal loyalty thereto that shows itself in obedience to the laws it enacts.

The other day I saw a leaf seized by the wind and driven swift and straight across the road. And a little farther on I saw some tiny birds also crossing the road. They turned this way and that picking up seeds as they went, full of the joy of life, and by and by they

got across. Was the welfare of the leaf necessarily greater than the welfare of the birds, or was the sum-total of success necessarily on the side of the leaf rather than on the side of the birds? Between a community of birds developed, comparatively speaking, by self-activity, and a community of dead leaves driven by the wind, it would not take us long to decide as to relative superiority.

We have much to learn from Germany as to what the democratic ideal demands by way of economic efficiency. There is nothing in the democratic ideal that is going to prevent us from profiting by her example if we will, although we may not be able to go so far or go so fast as she has done.

On the other hand, political and personal freedom are impossible in a feudal state like Germany.

In other words, there is in democracy an inherent power to correct its own mistakes and deficiencies. In an autocracy, no such power that is at all comparable with it, can from the nature of the case exist.

It is yet to be proved, we hear again and again, whether a democratic form of government is really superior to an autocratic form of government.

If this means that it is yet to be proved whether the democratic nations are going to wake up and learn how to do things well enough to cope with a highly organized efficient autocracy like Germany, it may well be true. If it means that democracy, in its essence, is to-day in point of superiority on trial as over against an autocracy in its essence, it is untrue.

Would anybody seriously maintain that the superiority of the status of contract between freeman and freeman on which our modern business world is built, is still open to question versus the superiority of slavery where a man was a chattel and belonged to his master in the same sense as did his horse or his house, or of the qualified slavery of feudalism where a man was sold by his baronial lord with the estate he helped to till? If progress throughout the evolution of human society has been marked in all its stages by an increase in personal

liberty, how can we question the relative superiority, in essence, of a great democracy like our own which is built on the foundations of personal liberty and of a great mechanism, comparatively speaking at least, like the German autocracy? There is the whole diameter of being betwixt the two.

But, it will be urged, that is the very pith of the argument that the unrestrained clash of individual interests does bring about economic slavery in a democracy. Moreover, this is an age of machinery. If we escape an all-powerful governmental machinery, yet we, in common with all civilized nations, are in danger of reducing free men to slavery again by the prevalence of physical machinery that takes away individual initiative and constructive thought, and reduces the worker to a slave as truly as slavery ever did. Neither a democratic nor an autocratic government can save us from this.

Shall we then turn the wheel of progress backward to a non-mechanical age? Surely not. As machinery delivered man from slavery

to begin with, so, as Wundt¹ points out, the new slavery with which machinery now in turn threatens the world by destroying initiative and intelligent workmanship can only be done away with by more and more machinery, until all men have sufficient leisure to give them the opportunity to live and to live happily and well.

In this era of machinery, what, then, can save the individual life from extinction? Perhaps we shall discover here how, as a democracy, we may reap the benefits of an autocracy and still save our souls alive.

How can we unite the two ideals of welfare and of freedom? Can we attain a clearer vision of the true democratic ideal by a combination of the German ideal and the American ideal than by treating them as altogether antithetical and antagonistic? This is an old question under a new form.

From the days of Hamilton and Jefferson even until now, the politics of this country have

¹ *Facts of the Moral Life*. Translated by Edward B. Titchener and Julia H. Gulliver. Macmillan Co.

swung to and fro between the centralization of authority in the general government and local self-management. Somehow or other, we have known that they must be united into an organic whole. Our national motto, *E pluribus unum*, has in it the fathomlessness and inexhaustibleness of the divine purposes. A government with such a motto can never take on *primarily* the characteristics of a mechanism. Rather "As the days of a tree are the days of my people." "I find no similitude so true as this of a Tree," says Carlyle—"its boughs with their buddings and disleafings—events, things suffered, things done. . . ." "Is not every leaf of it a biography?"

A living, breathing, throbbing common life that finds self-expression in every part, as each part finds self-expression in the life of the whole—this is democracy.

The national organism is a spiritual organism and so outruns even the similitude of the tree, since the personalities of which it is composed are individual expressions of the divine life and so are of ultimate and absolute value in

themselves. How can this spiritual organism attain the benefits of a great mechanism like the German government and still remain true to itself?

Our discussion suggests that economically the individual can be developed to his highest potency only by a mechanism—a centralized authority that will do away with the unrestrained clashing of individual and local interests. Is industrial freedom reconcilable with personal and political freedom? How are the two ideas of economic welfare and freedom to be united?—for if Professor Patten is right, economic welfare must result and can only result from a growing perfection of political and social mechanism as well as of physical machinery.

Machinery we must have. The only escape must be through our *attitude* toward machinery—physical and governmental. Gerald Lee in an article on "*The Machine Trainers*" in the February *Atlantic* of 1913 asks this pertinent question: Does the machinery rule men or men the machinery? The whole trick in managing

a locomotive, he points out, is to stop blaming it or running alongside of it and get up into the cab. Machines, he says, are the glorious self-assertion of man in matter. Wireless telegraph is man's arms, railways are his legs—his limbs as truly as are his limbs of flesh and blood. In like manner, Hudson Maxim in *Defenseless America* quotes Carlyle (*Sartor Resartus*) as follows: "The first ground handful of niter, sulphur, and charcoal drove Monk Schwartz's pestle through the ceiling. What will the last do?" It will "achieve the final undisputed prostration of force under thought, of animal courage under spiritual." "Such," Maxim still quotes Carlyle, "such I hold to be the genuine use of gunpowder; that it makes all men alike tall, . . . the Goliath powerless and the David resistless." From which it appears that an attitude may be adopted toward machinery that shall cause it not to enslave personality, but actually to enlarge its scope, and that to infinity.

What is this attitude? It is not the attitude that says: We will bring the powers of nature

into subjection to man's purposes. Rather it is: We will so study the laws of nature that we will coöperate with them. Gunpowder will blow its inventor to pieces just as quickly as any other man, if its laws are not understood and obeyed.

The laws of nature, properly understood, properly obeyed by way of coöperation and legitimate use, neither enslave nor are enslaved. Disobeyed, they crush. Coöperated with, they become extended legs and arms for the individual and the nation. To quote Gerald Lee again, machines, "like rain, sunshine, chemicals, all god-like things, say what we make them say"—better, what we enable them to say. How do we enable them to say it? By coöoperating with them through obedience to the laws that govern them, which we understand and they do not.

If this is true of physical machinery, why not of social and political machinery as well? Why, through coöperation instead of through coercion, may we not have more unity, more efficiency, more mechanism, if you will, in our democratic government than we have had hitherto?

tofore, and still remain a democracy, but a democracy more efficient than we have as yet known? Why may we not in this country realize Ezekiel's prophetic vision, when he saw the spirit of the living creature in the wheels?

Unity, efficiency, perfection of technique—their necessary accompaniment, depend primarily on knowledge and on expert knowledge.

But there is nothing undemocratic in knowledge, even in expert knowledge. As the physical machinery of the modern world is the result of an alliance between science and practical mechanical needs, so, according to Croly,¹ there must be an alliance between business and science, if we get a technical efficiency indispensable to a generally higher standard of living. "Scientific management in the largest sense of the word is coming to be the great critical and regenerative influence in business organization." This is resented, he says, by labor, because it means an unprecedented severity of shop discipline.

¹ Herbert Croly, *The Promise of American Life*. Macmillan Co., 1909.

But obedience is not undemocratic. The employee has got to see that his little egoistic me is only a part of his personality, that the big business in which he is engaged is an enlargement of that personality—an extension of his own arms and legs. Failure to coöperate with the law of the whole and intelligently to coöperate with the law of the whole, is like cutting off his own limbs. On the other hand, the employer that demands slavish submission from his employees and treats them like chattels, is like the man who thinks he has subjugated physical forces only to be blown up by his own gunpowder.

In politics, there is nothing undemocratic about knowledge, even in expert knowledge.

If Germany is more than a century behind the times in its doctrine of the feudal state, we are more than a century behind the times in our doctrine of *laissez-faire*, which means a belief that human nature has a certain instinctive goodness that will bring it out all right, if left alone, and so that the state must keep its hands off of the individual. In pioneer days when

we were in isolation from other nations and hence in non-competition with them, when we had a sparsely settled country, and the main problem was to live and let live in an unexhausted virgin wilderness, this doctrine worked fairly well.¹ But the time has come when if we hold our own among the nations, we shall have to wake up to the distinction between individuality and individualism. From our failure to do this has arisen our apotheosis of mediocrity and our prejudice against expertness. The doctrine of *laissez-faire* unchecked means license, not liberty. It means unrestrained egotism, not the development of personality as a living, breathing vital part of the larger whole, which we call the nation, and in which alone it can find its fulfilment.

Unrestricted individualism is as false to the true democratic ideal as is the Prussian idea of the divine right of the few to control the many. Unless, as Croly points out, we can be educated out of the idea that all that is necessary for

¹ Herbert Croly, *The Promise of American Life*. Macmillan Co., 1909.

commercial success is, simply the ingenuity and daring which uninstructed Yankeedom has been supposed to possess by nature, we are going to be wiped off the commercial map. The efficiency of our democracy will be perpetually challenged, until we educate public opinion so that responsible governmental positions from the President's office through Congress down to the various municipal offices, shall be filled not by men who happen by some accident to fill the public eye at the time of election or to strike the public fancy, not by men who are "available" and who are mere representatives of particular parties, but by men who have been specifically trained as experts for the work they are to do, men who are big in character and in statesmancraft and who are endued with practical sagacity in bringing the resources of scientific knowledge to bear on a given situation. That a man has been a successful general in war, is no indisputable and sufficient reason why he should be able to guide the ship of state. That he should be a successful business man—an acknowledged expert in making automobiles,

for instance—is no final proof that he will make a successful President of the United States. No successful commercial venture or educational project is ever carried through on that basis. We look always for experts—experts, too, that have proved by successful experience that they can do the thing we want them to do. The efficient business manager does not expect that an expert drummer will necessarily make a good sanitary engineer or does a college or university president go on the principle that a specialist in the Semitic languages can successfully teach calculus.

In sum, we must realize that the democratic ideal which demands that every man should have his own proper chance, becomes a fiasco when it is interpreted to mean that anybody is able and ought to be allowed to fill any and every kind of a position politically from the highest to the lowest.

The democratic ideal does not exclude but necessitates expert service to the state.

The democratic ideal demands not only trained minds, but trained characters—trained

to a feeling of responsibility for the good of this nation as a whole.

Are the politicians thinking of themselves as such a vital part of this republic that its interests are as the extension of their own legs and arms—bone of their bone, flesh of their flesh, failure to coöperate with which means self-mutilation and finally self-destruction? Time and again, the bitter facts are pointed out that the majority of our national and state legislators have but one question to ask with reference to a pending bill: "What is there in it for me?" and that there is only one thing that will influence them, namely, the fear of being put out of office. Our newspapers reek with contempt for our national Congress as being a set of pork-barrel rollers.

But who is responsible for all this? Who, but the body of enfranchised Americans who put them into office? Condemnation of our politicians is self-condemnation. In order that the democratic ideal may be realized in worthy leadership, we must distinguish, as we have not distinguished, between liberty and license of

speech. It has been said repeatedly that men of high character will not go into politics because of the mud-throwing in which our people indulge. Is it really necessary to villify and caricature our public men, in order to make sure that they are voicing the voice of the people? If so, the voice of the people is not thereby proving its worthiness to be voiced. In order that the democratic ideal be further realized in worthy leadership, we must realize that free speech must also be fair speech. Should it not belong to a national juvenalia already outgrown that the sentiments of so many of the newspapers of this country on a given situation can be known before they are opened, in that a republican paper will *a priori* condemn the action of a democratic leader or vice versa?

Is not fair play, then, of the very essence of the democratic ideal?

The complete enfranchisement of women is at our doors. What are we going to do with it?

You cannot do too much to help along all

humanitarian legislation. Work to get in office men who will further such legislation. But this is only an arc in the great circle of great ideas for which this nation must stand, not only if it fulfil its destiny, but if it even keep its place and name on the map of the earth.

As educated women, you are called primarily to become mothers of sons who shall be not politicians but statesmen, and this presupposes, first of all and most of all, what keenly informed intelligence, what clarity of vision, what greatness of soul, what self-control and self-consecration on your own part!

Secondly, if the enfranchisement of women is to result in an increase rather than in a diminution of our national efficiency, we have got to demonstrate that, given the ballot, we shall use it not for the loaves and fishes of personal interest it is going to bring us as women (if we are simply to repeat the tactics of the machine politician—*cui bono*), but that with informed and pure-hearted patriotism, we will use it to put men into office, not only or mainly because of their attitude toward the woman question,

important as that is, but because of their ability to conserve this great republic in the midst of the many and new and scarcely comprehended dangers that beset it and to lead it on to those "shining tablelands" of high endeavor which only a democracy makes possible.

Lastly, you are called to use that white flame of selfless devotion with which you, as representing the motherhood of the race, are so divinely endowed, to help, so far as in you lies, the best men and the enlightened men of this country to light up the dark places of our national ignorance, to rekindle the holy fires of our national patriotism so that it shall find expression not merely in fourth of July speeches, or other glittering generalities, but in the dark and devious ways of our national politics. Then shall our nation follow on to know the Lord as did Abraham Lincoln, who saw our national destiny "steadily and saw it whole" and who counted not life itself dear, if so be that this nation might be saved.

In discussing the efficiency of democracy, I wish, by way of summary, to make clear that,

to my mind, the best elements in the German system can help us to a truer conception of a true democracy than we now possess and that if we do not slough off certain confusions of thought and a certain dowdiness of ethical ideals just pointed out that we shall not only fail of our high mission to demonstrate to the world the possibility of a democratic form of government, but that we cannot indefinitely hold our own as a nation in the congress of highly organized, efficient European nationalities.

Intelligent and voluntary coöperation versus coercion—physical, political, or religious, is the characteristic note of the efficiency of a democracy as over against that of an autocracy. We want to get up in the cab of our social and economic and political engine instead of trying, like a setter dog I once saw, to race with the engine and so to do our individual stunt in competition with it, or to hurl ourselves under its wheels in mad antagonism to it.

Mind you, I am far from saying that co-operation does not exist and does not exist to an astonishing degree in Germany, more particu-

larly in the economic life of the nation. What I am saying is that coöperation, which is team work in its broadest, deepest, truest sense, will never be possible in an autocracy from the very nature of the case, since it is based on what is necessarily precluded by an autocracy as such, namely, the sacredness of personality.

Just so far as any system sponges out the human personality, just so far—and here I express my solemn conviction—just so far it is destined to perish.

We have not yet learned, as we must learn, our own lesson of the sacredness of personality. As the labor contract can only be between free man and free man, so true coöperation, I repeat, can only exist between personalities who recognize each other's rights and dignities and worth. To respect the rights and dignities and worth of our own personality and that of every other with whom we come in contact—do we do it? From the *casus belli* between nationalities to irritations between individuals, failure to do this, or supposed failure to do this, is the foundation rock of offense in this

work-a-day world of ours. Booker Washington had this sense of the sacredness of his own personality as few have had it. "I will suffer no man so to pull me down as to compel me to hate him." A recent writer interprets that mysterious utterance of the sermon on the mount: "Whosoever shall smite thee on the right cheek turn to him the other also," as meaning: "If one insults you, do not return the insult, rather let him repeat it than to degrade yourself to his level." Self-restraint versus loss of self-control is the most difficult of virtues. Yet that is what the sacredness of personality demands of us, first and foremost. It is demanded, first and foremost, by the spirit of democracy.

To make the employee, the servant in the house, the little child feel that the dignity and rights germane to them are as unquestionably theirs as the dignity and rights of their employers or their elders, is also demanded by the spirit of democracy. Some writer tells of a little child who was playing with a toy engine his father had just given him. The mother called the boy to supper. The child did not

respond. The fact of the matter was he was so absorbed he did not hear her. The mother thought it was disobedience on the part of the child. She snatched the engine from him, put it out of his reach, picked him up, and placed him forcibly in his chair at the table. Her husband leaned across to her and whispered one word: "Thief." The engine was the child's own property; she had not rightly respected his rights.

It is becoming common to speak of this country as a melting pot. Save the mark! If that is what it is, it has ceased to be a democracy. Nevertheless it is indeed our high destiny to show that even

". . . in the mud and scum of things
There alway, alway something sings."¹

Other nations, as Steiner points out, have turned religious ideals into stone, lace, and lilies.² But what of the Woolworth Building, he says—the national five- and ten-cent enterprise,

¹ *Music*, Ralph Waldo Emerson.

² *Introducing the American Spirit*, Edward A. Steiner. Fleming H. Revell Co.

which has caused "spools of thread, granite ware, and dustcloths" to flower into purest Gothic. And again the same writer makes articulate the American spirit as endeavoring to "shape a new nation out of the world's refuse." The United States a melting pot? Nay, rather it is the country that shall gather the peoples of all nations into its arms as one family, because of their noble lineage, because of their common lineage with the highest born American—"which was the son of Seth, which was the son of Adam, which was the son of God."

These United States are the promised Bethlehem of the world. So the trend of events teaches. No manger so lowly that Immanuel—the indwelling God—may not there be born, whether that lowliness represents the heart of the ignorant emigrant, the clang of machinery, the mechanisms of social and economic life, or the unhallowed ways of politics. May we be granted grace to see ourselves, our fellows, our country *sub specie aeternitatis*—under the aspect of eternity.

If we are true to our ideals of democracy, it is not enough with us that external force should mechanically produce results rapid, perfect, but uninfluenced by the free human spirit of each and every one who brings them about—the spirit of the living creature in the wheels. More specifically, it is not enough that marriage, for instance, shall have passed with us from status to legal contract. It must not only recognize the personality of the contracting parties; it must also recognize the depths of that personality, for—I quote Purington—"all thought of marriage belongs to the shrine that nothing may illumine but the altar fire." It is not enough with us that the tilling of the fields be made a science; though it must be made a science, it must also become, as Steiner says, it must also become a "*sacrament*." It is not enough (and here you will recognize Ruskin¹)—it is not enough that the soldier lay down his life for this country rather than leave his post in battle, the physician rather than leave his post in plague, the pastor rather than to teach

¹ *Unto This Last (The Roots of Honor)*.

falsehood, the lawyer rather than to countenance injustice, but the merchant must also lay down his life for this country in that "it becomes his duty, not only to be always considering how to produce what he sells in the purest and cheapest forms, but how to make the various employments involved in the production or transference of it most beneficial to the men employed." Let us carry Ruskin's thought in this passage a step farther and say that our public men must cease to be politicians whose master-passion is the upbuilding of their own fortunes and must become statesmen whose master-passion is the upbuilding of this great nation.

It is not enough in our country for a man to do his best through enforced obedience and to receive his best through state encouragement and protection. Rather must he attain the full stature of a man through a big-visioned self-direction and self-expression in the larger self of the business or the community of which he forms a part as bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh, and through a chance to play a

man's part in a world of men by means of self-help, self-control, self-consecration. It is not enough that in our country we be born of the flesh. We must also be born of the Spirit.

Egoistic interests, party interests, class interests—God forbid that this country must be steeped in blood as Europe has had to be steeped in blood before we learn how little "those little old things" really matter.

God forbid that like the Hebrew nation we should learn what true national loyalty means only after we have been swept as a nation off the face of the earth.

God grant us grace that with heart and soul and mind and strength the flame of a passionate and selfless patriotism may fire our souls before it is yet too late, a patriotism that finds expression in those immortal words:

"If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, may my right hand forget her cunning. May my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth."

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY
BERKELEY

Return to desk from which borrowed.
This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

29 Mar '50 AP

29 Mar '50 AP

28 Aug '51 SP

14 Aug '51 W

14 Oct '54 GH

Oct 1 1955 LHM

23 Oct '61 DT

RECD LD

OCT 18 1961

RECD LD

MAY 28 1963

15 Oct '63 MF

RECD LD

OCT 1 '63 - 4 PM

DEC 24 1969 06

RECD LD DEC 11 '69 - 3 PM

SEP 15 1996
RECEIVED

DEC 12 1995

CIRCULATION DEPT

~~Spec. coll.~~
PSO

U. C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



CO51410151

Y

357378

TR 423
GB

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

